

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE JOB FACTORS  
AFFECTING THE REENLISTMENT OF MARINES  
IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FIELDS

Rayon Hughes Carlisle

Library  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California 93940

# NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

## Monterey, California



# THESIS

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE JOB FACTORS  
AFFECTING THE REENLISTMENT OF MARINES  
IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FIELDS

by

Rayon Hughes Carlisle, Jr.

March 1975

Thesis Advisor:

Robert A. Stephan

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

T165955



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) An Investigation into the Job Factors Affecting the Reenlistment of Marines in the Telecommunications Fields		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis; March 1975
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Rayon Hughes Carlisle, Jr.		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		12. REPORT DATE March 1975
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Enlisted Retention Job Satisfaction U.S. Marine Corps Telecommunications		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Using the questionnaire results from the Marine Corps Task Analysis Program, an investigation was made into the job factors affecting the reenlistment decisions of enlisted Marines in the telecommunications fields--operational communications and telecommunications maintenance. The results showed that career satisfaction is the main correlate with reenlistment for both first term and career Marines		



although the job factors supporting this vary between and within the career groups. For first-term Marines, feelings of achievement and interest in the work itself were common job factors which were significantly different for the dichotomized reenlistment decision. For the first-term operational communicators, family and social life perceptions were also significant.

Career Marines' perceptions included all intrinsic job factors as significantly different. Pay, policy matters, peers, and supervisors were significant extrinsic factors affecting the reenlistment decision.



An Investigation into the Job Factors Affecting the  
Reenlistment of Marines  
in the Telecommunications Fields

by

Rayon Hughes Carlisle, Jr.  
Captain, United States Marine Corps Reserve  
B.A., California State University, Long Beach, 1972

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

---

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

Thesis

C 227

2-1

## ABSTRACT

Using the questionnaire results from the Marine Corps Task Analysis Program, an investigation was made into the job factors affecting the reenlistment decisions of enlisted Marines in the telecommunications fields--operational communications and telecommunications maintenance.

The results showed that career satisfaction is the main correlate with reenlistment for both first-term and career Marines although the job factors supporting this vary between and within the career groups. For first-term Marines, feelings of achievement and interest in the work itself were common job factors which were significantly different for the dichotomized reenlistment decision. For the first-term operational communicators, family and social life perceptions were also significant.

Career Marines' perceptions included all intrinsic job factors as significantly different. Pay, policy matters, peers, and supervisors were significant extrinsic factors affecting the reenlistment decision.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION-----	7
II.	BACKGROUND-----	9
	A. JOB SATISFACTION-----	9
	B. REWARDS-----	11
	C. SATISFACTION AND RETENTION-----	13
III.	ENLISTMENT AND RETENTION STUDIES IN THE MARINE CORPS-----	17
IV.	THE MARINE CORPS TASK ANALYSIS PROGRAM-----	23
	A. PROGRAM METHODOLOGY-----	24
	B. ANALYSIS-----	25
	C. THE CURRENT STUDY-----	26
	D. ASSUMPTIONS-----	27
	E. AREAS OF INVESTIGATION-----	29
	F. METHODOLOGY-----	29
	G. SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER MARINES-----	30
	H. SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM MARINES-----	32
V.	RESULTS-----	34
	A. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS-----	34
	B. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS-----	40
	FIGURES-----	46
	BIBLIOGRAPHY-----	60
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST-----	64



## LIST OF FIGURES

I.	JOB FACTORS EXAMINED IN STUDY-----	46
II.	SAMPLE OF PRINTOUT FOR TASK ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE-----	49
III.	JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER OPCOM BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION-----	50
IV.	JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM OPCOM BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION-----	51
V.	JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER MAINT BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION-----	52
VI.	JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM MAINT BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION-----	53
VII.	JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER OPCOM LISTED BY DIFFERENCE-----	54
VIII.	JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM OPCOM LISTED BY DIFFERENCE-----	55
IX.	JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER MAINT LISTED BY DIFFERENCE-----	56
X.	JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM MAINT LISTED BY DIFFERENCE-----	57
XI.	SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS FOR OPCOM MARINES-----	58
XII.	SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS FOR MAINT MARINES-----	59



## I. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of job factors and their relationships to personnel retention is a topic of continuing interest in civilian and military contexts for both the managerial and the worker levels. While the United States Navy, Army, and Air Force have been analyzed in relative depth in this regard, the United States Marine Corps has had only one study dealing with the factors affecting first-term enlisted Marines and their attitudes toward reenlistment in the Marine Corps [Angle, 1972]; none have been discovered dealing with the attitudes of career Marines.

This paper is an investigation of a small sector of the Marine Corps: those who were assigned in the operational communications and the telecommunications maintenance occupational fields. The vehicle used for this analysis was the recent Marine Corps Task Analysis Program, an exhaustive examination of twenty-nine occupational fields within the Marine Corps. This analysis covered all aspects of each occupational field from those tasks which the Marines actually performed to questions regarding job factors and job satisfaction.

This paper is presented in four parts. The first is a review of the literature dealing with job satisfaction and employee retention. Then follows a review of studies extant on first enlistment Marines and Marine recruits regarding their generalized attitudes and perceptions of the Marine Corps and their part in it. The third part is a



recapitulation of the purpose and methodology of the Marine Corps Task Analysis Program and the extraction of the data for this paper from it. Finally, a summary is presented of the results of the author's investigation into the possible existence of any significant differences in the Marines' perceptions of the job factors queried in the Task Analysis Program. The comparison was made between career and first-term Marines in the two occupational fields mentioned above who had expressed a definite intention about reenlisting in or leaving the Marine Corps. A secondary area of investigation was whether the significant job factors were intrinsic or extrinsic factors.



## II. BACKGROUND

### A. JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction has been the subject of many treatises trying to explain its causes and effects. Herzberg, in his famous Two-Factor Theory, [Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959] saw job satisfaction arising from the influence of work-situation variables (called satisfiers or "motivators") which produced positive, but not negative, job attitudes. That is, they could cause the worker to be satisfied with his job if they were present, but their absence would not cause him to become dissatisfied with the job. Another set of job variables (dissatisfiers or "hygienes") could produce job dissatisfaction by their absence but their presence would not assure job satisfaction. Motivators were job content factors such as recognition, achievement, the employee's felt degree of responsibility, feelings about the work itself and his opportunities for advancement. Hygienes were job context variables and dealt with factors such as company policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, salary, status, and job security, as well as interactions with supervisors, peers, and subordinates. Motivators were intrinsic to the job; hygienes were extrinsic factors.

That these hygienes were not motivational in nature, Herzberg ascribed to the evidence he gleaned from his research: they only produced a one-time response when administered,



changed, or used as rewards. Using only hygiene factors makes necessary a continual process of charging an employee up to perform and then having to recharge him for the next performance. Motivators had the effect of a generator being installed in the person: a continuing source of motivation resulting from the innate satisfactions that the motivators induced. [Herzberg, 1968]

In Herzberg's view, the lack of some or all of the motivators would reduce a person's satisfaction with his job, but would not cause dissatisfaction with it, while the elimination of any negative factors associated with the hygienes would reduce dissatisfaction without increasing satisfaction.

"The opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but, rather, no job satisfaction; and, similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction, but no job dissatisfaction." [Herzberg, 1968]

Others, notably March and Simon (1958), Porter and Lawler (1968), and Hackman and Lawler (1971), felt that the employee's perceptions of the fitness of the rewards resulting from his efforts played a larger role in his feelings of satisfaction with his job. The hypothesis was that when performance leads to rewards the individual perceives as equitable, high satisfaction will result. Thus, job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which rewards that are actually received meet or exceed that level which the individual believes is "fair." Hence, satisfaction is a function of the employee's perceptions of what are, to him, fair rewards for a given level of performance. These rewards may take various forms. They may be tangible rewards such as pay increases, merit promotions,



and the like; or they may be in the form of recognition or appraisals which are less tangible but nonetheless affect the employee's perceived status and level of recognition. The greater the failure of actual rewards to meet or exceed the perceived equitable rewards, the more dissatisfied a person will be in a given situation. [Porter and Lawler, 1968]

Hackman and Lawler (1971) predicted that job satisfaction would more readily result from jobs that were high on variety, autonomy, task identity, and feedback. But regardless of the amount of feedback (or variety, or autonomy, or task identity) that a worker really had in his job, it was how much that he perceived that he had that affected his reactions to his job. Thus, they put forth the view that the employee's perceptions of his job were of central importance in affecting his job attitudes and behaviors, but that the major determinant of such perceptions was the objective makeup of the job itself. However, even though jobs appeared to be highly potent in determining employee motivation and satisfaction, it was not suggested that there was a best way to design a job. Instead, it was suggested that the substantial motivational potential of jobs would be realized only when the psychological demands and opportunities of jobs meshed well with the personal needs and goals of the employees who worked on them.

## B. REWARDS

As was pointed out before, it can be the worker's perception of the fairness of the reward and his ability to equate the reward to a particular performance that can induce a



motivation to continued performance. Whether this reward leads to satisfaction and thus influences continued performance, or whether the performance which brought on the reward also caused the satisfaction, is really of secondary importance. Vroom [1964] indicated that both praise and criticism could be expected to be effective sources of task motivation only if their attainment was believed to be contingent upon the level of task performance. Nor was man's desire to work to be explained solely in terms of an instrumental relationship to tangible rewards. Vroom felt that work was also used by workers to use and develop their skills, to attain social acceptance and the respect of others, and to give themselves an opportunity to make a worthwhile contribution to society.

McClelland [1967] saw rewards and incentives, including pay, as "punctuation marks. They break up sequences (of performance) or call attention to them." Psychologically speaking, they are attention-getting, affect-producing mechanisms, rather than substitutes for something else. McClelland preferred to regard money rewards as one of a class of attention-getters which, like any other member of the class, can lose its effectiveness with repetition. This could possibly explain why Herzberg saw money as a hygienic factor: it had lost some of its effectiveness in getting the attention of those to whom it was offered as a reward. It would also explain in part the findings of Malinovsky and Barry [1965]. They tested the applicability of Herzberg's theory on 117 blue-collar workers and found that both motivators and hygienics could be distinguished but that they were



positively related to job satisfaction in contradiction of Herzberg's theory.

Two types of reward structure were identified by Varney [1971]. The first structure was built around the fundamental human needs: protection from physical wants; protection from danger, threat, and deprivation; and, the need to belong, to associate, to be accepted. The second reward structure, and the most important to Varney, was the one built around the motivational system. It is internal and offers more lasting rewards. Varney did not demean tangible rewards as ineffective motivators. He merely rated their importance as lower and their effect as more temporary.

Rewards are the evidence by which an individual can measure whether or not, and how much, he has achieved, performed, and been recognized. If achievement is only one of a person's unfulfilled needs, he may be motivated by his own sense of achievement. But, if his sense of achievement depends upon rewards for confirmation, he will then need the rewards as well as the sense of achievement.

### C. SATISFACTION AND RETENTION

While the issue of the interdependence of satisfaction and performance has been the source of various opinions regarding their contiguity and causality, satisfaction and retention have been shown to give evidence of a more consistent relationship.

Vroom [1964] found a consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and the probability of resignation.



The less satisfied a worker was, the greater the tendency was to leave the organization. He also found a less consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and absences. This relationship appeared to emerge most consistently with unexcused absences and the frequency of absence. Again, both increased as job satisfaction decreased.

Lawler [1970] felt that turnover and absenteeism, being related to satisfaction, should be greatest among the poor performers because of their resultant dissatisfaction. With Hackman [1971], he indicated that since the routine, non-challenging, simple jobs often lead to employee dissatisfaction, these are the jobs that lead to absenteeism and turnover. MacDonald and Gunderson [1974], in an analysis of Navy reenlistment factors, supported the idea that those jobs which are generally considered the most routine, arduous, dirty, or hazardous were the least satisfying. On the other hand, those jobs which are high in variety, autonomy, feedback, and task identification result in a high degree of job satisfaction. (Compare with Hackman and Lawler, above.)

Turnover is defined as a measure of the motivation to participate, i.e., to join and stay with an organization. [Atchison and Lefferts, 1974] The employee's attitudes toward a job should affect the decision to participate to a greater degree than they affect performance. [March and Simon, 1958] The individual notes the inducements offered by the organization and the contributions he has to make. As long as the individual feels that the relationships between these



contributions and inducements are positive, he will most likely remain on the job. Since the extrinsic [job context] rewards are the only ones under the immediate control of the organization, they are the inducements which most clearly enter into this exchange. Thus, March and Simon held that if there was a relationship between job satisfaction factors and turnover, it should have been that the extrinsic factors were more clearly relatable to turnover than were the intrinsic [job content] factors. Hulin [1966] recognized that certain other factors such as the condition of the labor market, the ages of the workers, financial responsibilities, and employment prospects could overcome any relationship between job satisfaction and turnover, ceteris paribus.

Patchen [1970] suggested that one factor of job satisfaction was identity with the organization: feelings of solidarity with the organization, support of the organization, and the perception of shared characteristics with other organization members. He felt that the individual must perceive similarities between himself and the other members of the organization, particularly with the organization's leadership. This contributed to the person's feeling of solidarity with the organization, which in turn contributed to a motivation of loyalty to the organization. He listed, among others, the following organizational factors which can contribute to satisfaction in being a member of the organization: 1) individual and organizational goal congruence; 2) participation in decisions; 3) achievement opportunities; 4) reward systems;



5) mobility chances; 6) the nature of personal relations; 7) relative member status; and, 8) organizational status among outsiders.

Whether or not satisfaction leads to better performance (or conversely), it has been repeatedly demonstrated by social scientists that unsatisfied employees do not often remain in a given job or career situation that does not meet their needs. The employee's perception of his immediate and future needs will thus greatly influence his career choice, his motivation, and his job performance. If the chosen career does not meet his perceived needs, the worker will be less satisfied than if they had been met and his propensity to quit the organization will increase.



### III. ENLISTMENT AND RETENTION STUDIES IN THE MARINE CORPS

Relatively few studies have been conducted into why young men enlist in the Marine Corps and even fewer probe the reasons why some Marines remain with the Corps after the first enlistment. In a study of the attitudes of American youth toward military service, Nadel [1973] elicited the following perceptions of the Marine Corps in four surveys conducted from May 1971 through November 1972:

- Best chance to prove oneself a man.
- Has the most capable men.
- Most attractive uniform.
- Best overall single service.
- Least chance to use one's skills and abilities.
- Least chance to get ahead in a career.
- Least preferred branch of service in a no-draft situation.
- Least chance to learn new and useful skills.

The rank order of inducements to enter the Marine Corps based upon data gained from these surveys showed the following reasons were those most given for considering the Marine Corps as a choice of service:

- Officer training.
- Skills training.
- Pay.
- Choice of assignment.
- Paid college education.
- Opportunity for travel.

Bennett et al. [1972] found that, overall, the employment rate played a minimal role in determining enlistment rates. In addition, he found that Marine volunteers were least sensitive to the efforts of recruiters. He saw in this a reflection of the fact that the Marines offered no specific



training, organizational nor geographic guarantees, and had a slower promotion rate than the other services. Fisher and Harford [1973] noted that Marine enlistees were much more likely to endorse patriotism as a strong influence in their enlistment decision as compared to those joining the other service branches.

Wilkins [1967] found that while many Marines tend to enlist for "less than positive reasons," their opinions of the Marine Corps went up as training got underway. One favorable aspect reported was discipline, suggesting that adolescent males may need limits as clinical psychologists have long pointed out. Marines appreciate the need for discipline--unit discipline and self discipline--and the attitude of Marines toward discipline is positive: it leads to success in battle! This is to say that in the Marine Corps' view the best discipline is that which is imposed from within. It is not based upon fear and repression, but upon the installation within the individual the attitude that immediate and unswerving response to directives, to their spirit as well as to their letter, yields the best chance for accomplishing the assigned mission and for satisfying personal as well as unit goals. This response is not intended to be unthinking or robot-like. It is based upon a history of confidence: confidence of the individual Marine in himself and in his fellow Marines, superior and subordinate. He becomes aware through close association that his superiors are competent and have his overall welfare at heart. He sees that his peers are reliable, capable, and proud of their association.



This study also substantiated the fact that Marine boot camp caught the recruits' attention and contributed greatly to a feeling of accomplishment. The recruits' perceptions showed that the work is hard, challenging, and rewarding, mentally and physically. Another perception evinced was that during this phase of training, differences among individuals are discouraged in order to produce a common foundation on which to build: that of the basic, infantry-oriented Marine.

In the few studies available concerning the attitudes of first-term enlisted Marines, several factors emerge. One is that the attitudes of Marines toward the Marine Corps and its leaders remain nearly as favorable after two years' service as they were immediately following recruit training (boot camp). [Nelson and Berry, 1966]

Marine boot camp is as intense a motivational period as the enlisted Marine will ever encounter and should result in a relatively high level of enthusiasm toward the Marine Corps, during recruit training and upon its completion. This is especially so in view of the fact that the young recruit has satisfactorily completed a rigorous training schedule. The above survey showed that at both times, during recruit training and two years later, the attitudes toward leaders were more favorable than toward the Marine Corps as an organization (significant at the .01 level). It was concluded that the sustained attitude was indicative of the Marines' perception of the importance of their mission, even though no combat duty had been experienced by those polled. It was also noted that



the individual's attitude toward his job and his unit were, in part, a function of his own personal accomplishments within that organization, e.g., rank attained. Attitudes were also more favorable among those Marines of lower educational attainment and those serving in an infantry unit.

In general, the factors which contributed to the rise in opinion about the Marine Corps was that the instruction received was good; that the Marine Corps makes a man out of one; that discipline is good for a person; that the non-commissioned officers respect the men; that the non-commissioned officers are well-qualified and know how to get the most out of the recruits. Attitude items which clustered around the estimate that they would find Marine Corps life enjoyable were that the man had learned a good deal, that good work was noticed and commended by officers who were understanding, and that the officers and non-commissioned officers respected the recruits. Other factors were that there was evidence of a mutual respect within the Corps between senior and subordinate; that the individual Marine was indeed recognized as an individual; that seniors are respected for their competence as well as their authority; that officers and non-commissioned officers are quite willing to take the same risks and to lead the same arduous life as the men; and, that reasonable job assignments would be made based upon aptitude and interest.

No studies were unearthed which investigated or otherwise commented upon the perceptions or attitudes of Marines on their second or subsequent enlistments. This is not only



true of the Marine Corps, but for the other services as well. Little analysis of this group of professional military men has been done except as a possible adjunct to studies about first-term enlisted men. Whether this is an oversight brought about through apathy or through concern mainly with the problems of recruitment in a zero-draft environment is unknown. What is known is that these trained men have developed skills and abilities that are even more difficult to replace than are those of the departing first-term enlistees.

An assessment of the desirability of career choices in terms of specific Marine Corps occupational fields [Gilbert and Yellen, 1973] showed the following preference order among recruits in the third week of training:

Motor Transport	24.15%
Military Police/Corrections	13.16%
Shore Party	7.37%
Utilities	7.00%
Infantry	5.31%
Telecommunications Maintenance	2.42%
Operational Communications	1.21%

The above data were not substantially different from a similar survey conducted in 1948 except that the infantry occupational field ranked second in the earlier survey while Military Police/Corrections was not listed.

It was the intent of this study to explore the job factors affecting the reenlistment intention of career and first-term Marines in these latter two occupational fields in order to determine the contributions of any particular job factors on intention. Since these are two of the least popular fields in terms of desirability upon enlistment, any identification



of factors bearing upon the reenlistment decision was considered to be imminently useful.



#### IV. THE MARINE CORPS TASK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

In order to provide a comprehensive review, analysis, and evaluation of the work performed by Marines throughout the Marine Corps, the Marine Corps Task Analysis Program was begun in 1969. [USMC, 1974] The program was designed to acquire factual data considered essential for proper manpower utilization within the Marine Corps. The Task Analysis Program is conducted by the Office of Manpower Utilization, an activity of the Manpower Plans and Policies Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps. The office is organized into task analysis teams with computer programming support. Each team is assigned responsibility for one entire occupational field within the Marine Corps, from the beginning to the end of the analysis of that occupational field (OF).

Task analyses have been, or are being, performed on each of twenty-nine occupational fields for enlisted Marines in order to identify, collect and collate job data. The purpose of the task analyses is to solve problems in the areas of:

1. The proper assignment of personnel to occupational fields and military occupational specialties within those fields.
2. The provision of adequate training of personnel for the military occupational specialty assigned without costly and unnecessary overtraining.
3. The proper classification and assignment of recruits in accordance with their aptitude scores to tie their training and their job in with their interests and abilities.



4. The construction of a workable grade and military occupational specialty (MOS) structure to provide for an orderly upward movement in rank while retaining the desired rank strengths.
5. The accurate description of worker requirements which reflect what is happening in a job, and not what is assumed to be happening.
6. The validation of each MOS and OF to ensure its necessity, accurate identification, and proper utilization.

The data collected are the results of answers from Marine job incumbents to questions of the type:

What does the Marine really do?  
Why does he perform his job?  
How does he perform his job?  
What skill levels and attributes does he require to perform his job?

#### A. PROGRAM METHODOLOGY

The program consists of seven phases. The study phase is a gathering of background information by the analysis team on the target OF. The observation and interview phase is carried out by the analysts travelling to selected Marine Corps commands to observe and interview Marines working in the field under study, in the actual performance of their jobs. From this preliminary investigation, a Task Analysis Questionnaire is constructed which includes all tasks (work) done at the learner, worker, first-line supervisor, and staff supervisor levels, since a job incumbent may perform tasks above or below his designated skill level. The analysis teams then return to major Marine commands to administer the questionnaire to as many Marines in the OF as can be reached. The processing phase consists of machine-reading and recording the data at a field activity automatic data processing center. The data



are then analyzed with an eye toward improvements in the functional areas of classification, assignment, training, grade and MOS structure, job requirements, and job validation.

## B. ANALYSIS

Early in the study of an OF, the population structure of that OF is examined. That population is then formed into clusters according to length of service, current job title, educational level, school attendance, and many other biographical data. From these, the credibility of current job descriptions is examined. This is done with the help of Computerized Data Analysis Program - 360 (CODAP 360). [Cummins and Shahan, 1974] CODAP produces a tree-structured diagram showing the clustering process. Cluster analyses and comparisons may then be accomplished using several criteria, such as, percentage of working time spent on a task, training required to perform a task, job satisfaction, and the like. An acceptable job description can be devised if the job accounts for more than fifty percent of the work time common to the particular cluster.

The final report of the task analysis is prepared by the Director, Manpower Plans and Policies Division, and is then forwarded to the Chief of Staff, HQMC, for decision. Implementation is monitored by the Manpower Control Branch of HQMC to assure that appropriate action is taken upon the approved analysis recommendations.



### C. THE CURRENT STUDY

The particular occupational fields which made up the heart of the current study were OF 25--Operational Communications (OPCOM)--and OF 28--Telecommunications Maintenance (MAINT). The OPCOM field includes wiremen, radio and teletype operators, microwave equipment operators, communications and message center personnel, and supervisory personnel. It also includes Special Communications personnel who were the subjects of a separate analysis, not included here.

The MAINT field is made up of telephone and teletype technicians, radio repairmen and technicians, dial central technicians, digital subscriber terminal technicians, instrument and calibration technicians, and communications security equipment technicians.

The Task Analysis Program queried some 1,950 OPCOM and 898 MAINT Marine enlisted men. Upon entering the response data into the CODAP 360 program, however, many of the inputs were rejected. The output thus contained data on only 700 OPCOM Marines and 850 Marines in the MAINT field.

In order to analyze the factors affecting the retention of both the career and first-term Marines in both fields, the author concentrated on those questions in the Task Analysis Questionnaire which were inserted to measure job factors. (See Figure I.)

The automated data processing (ADP) outputs provided the following study sample sizes.



	OPCOM		MAINT		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Career</u>	<u>First-term</u>	<u>Career</u>	<u>First-term</u>	
Will reenlist	75*	30	195	41	341
Won't reenlist	56	356	97	220	729
Totals	131	386	292	261	1070

\*The above sample sizes are population averages,  $\bar{N}$ , rather than the actual values in each case since not all factors had the same number of usable responses. In the computations for each variable, however, the actual sample value,  $N$ , was used in each case. The figures given here are only a representation of the relative sample sizes for the data.

#### D. ASSUMPTIONS

Few assumptions were made regarding the inputs furnished for this study. Due to the sample sizes, it was assumed that the distribution of the means for each occupational field was approximately normal and that due to the approach made by the Task Analysis Teams to the Corps-wide survey and the command interest generated, few inconsistencies in responses would be found.

Even though there is a degree of reasonableness in the assumption that, in general, the perceptions of the career enlisted Marines would be similar to each other and distinct from those of the first-term enlisted Marines (those with less than four years' active-duty service), it was felt that the subsumption of both the OPCOM and the MAINT fields into single career and first-term groups would be too imprecise.

While the two occupational fields do comprise the larger telecommunications field, the nature of the work varies between the two. The OPCOM personnel are the radio operators, wiremen, teletype and telegraph operators, and message center



personnel, all concerned with communications processing, handling, and distribution. These Marines operate the radio transceivers, switchboards, and message center equipment so vital to the command and control of Marine combat units. The various occupational specialties in this field are demanding of time and intelligence, require close attention to format and detail, and are circumscribed by rules, regulations, operating procedures, and conditions of secrecy and confidentiality. However, the training period required to produce the operational communicator is relatively short when compared to that required to produce a basically trained repairman or technician.

Marines in the MAINT field are less circumscribed by requirements of format and procedural methods. They are more independent in the diagnostic and repair aspects of their jobs, and may have responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of several complex equipments at the same time. They are taught certain procedures in efficient diagnostics, are supervised, and must adhere to certain quality assurance standards set up by higher authority. However, they would appear to have more freedom of action in their daily work.

Although there is much interaction between OPCOM and MAINT personnel, the technician's role is often that of consultant and problem-solver. Also, where the operator may be required to spend four or more hours at a time on watch at a radio transceiver or a switchboard, the technician is seldom faced with such a routine. He will more likely be on call at the maintenance facility.



## E. AREAS OF INVESTIGATION

The areas of investigation for this study were three:

- (1) Was there a significant different in any of the job factors as perceived by career and first-term Marines, in either occupational field, when viewed regarding their intentions to reenlist? If so, what were these factors?
- (2) Were the significant job factors intrinsic or extrinsic?
- (3) What did these factors indicate regarding the perceptions of the career and first-term Marines about a Marine Corps career?

## F. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used to determine whether or not there were any groupings of intrinsic and extrinsic factors, was to compare sample means given for each of the occupational fields, based upon two other variables: (1) whether or not the respondent indicated a positive or a negative intention to reenlist; and (2) whether the respondent had less than four years' service or four or more years' service. Thus, the complete breakdown for the Job Factors from the Task Analysis Questionnaire was:

### Occupational Field 25 - Operational Communications (OPCOM)

#### Career Marine

Will reenlist  
Will not reenlist

#### First-term Marine

Will reenlist  
Will not reenlist

### Occupational Field 28 - Telecommunications Maintenance (MAINT)

#### Career Marine

Will reenlist  
Will not reenlist

#### First-term Marine

Will reenlist  
Will not reenlist



ADP printouts of the Task Analysis Questionnaire results were obtained from the Office of Manpower Management, Headquarters, USMC, which provided the statistical base for this study. The printouts were arranged by occupational field and were further arranged by career status and response to the question of reenlistment intention. Figure II is a sample of the printout format and shows the response breakdown for the MAINT Marines to the factor "INTERESTING WORK."

The sample means for those Marines deciding for and against reenlistment were then compared, using the student's t-distribution. Figures III, IV, V, and VI give the results of this comparison. The level of significance chosen was for  $t = 2.576$  corresponding to  $p = .01$ . Once the significant factors were identified, all of the job factors were ordered by the magnitude of the difference between the mean responses for and against reenlistment within each subset. Figures VII through X show the resultant listings.

#### G. SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER MARINES

When the significant job factors for the career Marines were evaluated with respect to a hypothetical mean response of 4.00 (the average of the possible extreme responses, i.e.,  $\frac{1 + 7}{2} = 4$ ), the following points were noted:

1. For the career Marines in both occupational fields stating that they intended to reenlist, all mean responses to significant job factors were above 4.00.
2. For the career Marines in the OPCOM field not reenlisting, all mean responses--save those to Unit Objectives,



Initiative, and Co-workers--were below 4.00. For the career Marines in the MAINT field who were not reenlisting, all mean responses to significant job factors were below 4.00 with the exception of Worthwhile, Initiative, and Unit Objectives.

3. The job factors identified as significant for the OPCOM career Marines were the entire list of intrinsic job factors covering the spectrum of achievement, growth, the work itself, responsibility, and recognition. In addition, significant extrinsic factors were identified which dealt with policy, (Do the rules and regulations governing your job enhance your efficiency?) with peers, (I have the cooperation and support of my co-workers necessary to do my work efficiently) and with supervisors (My supervisor provides me with adequate and on-going feedback on my performance). The perceptions regarding the career and job satisfaction questions were also significantly different.

4. For the career MAINT Marines, all but one of the intrinsic factors were significant. The exception was "My job allows me to see or know the results of my efforts." Again, the responses to the questions regarding career and job satisfaction were significantly different for the reenlisting and non-reenlisting career Marines in the MAINT field. The only extrinsic job factor identified as significant for this group was that dealing with pay (I am fairly paid for the work I do).



## H. SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM MARINES

When the significant job factors were evaluated with respect to a hypothetical average response of 4.00, the following points were noted:

1. For the first-term Marines in both occupational fields stating that they intended to reenlist, all mean responses to significant factors were above 4.00.

2. For the first-term Marines in both occupational fields stating that they did not intend to reenlist, all mean responses to these same factors were below 4.00.

3. The job factors identified as significant for the OPCOM first-term Marines dealt with achievement, (My work gives me a feeling of worthwhile achievement) and the work itself, (The work I do is interesting to me). In addition, there was a significant difference in the response to the statement, "I am satisfied with my military career to date."

4. The job factors identified as significant for the MAINT first-term Marines dealt with achievement (My work gives me a feeling of worthwhile achievement. Doing my present work gives me a feeling of pride and self-respect) and the work itself (My job is at least useful to enable my unit to meet its objectives). In addition, there was a significant difference in the perceptions regarding family and social life (an extrinsic job factor) for this group (My work does not seriously interfere with my family and my social life). As did the OPCOM first-term Marines, the MAINT group showed a significant difference in the responses to the question on



career satisfaction. There was also a significant difference in the perceptions regarding job satisfaction (Overall, I am satisfied with my present job).



## V. RESULTS

This study revealed that for all the Marines in the sample under scrutiny, career satisfaction was the common factor which was most closely aligned with the decision to reenlist. Those who indicated that they would reenlist expressed a positive feeling about their career satisfaction. The opposite was true for those who had decided not to reenlist. For the first-term Marines, positive feelings about the work itself and a sense of worthwhile accomplishment were significant supporters of career satisfaction. In addition, for the first-term MAINT Marines, those deciding against reenlisting cited serious interference with their family and social lives as the important extrinsic factor.

For the career Marines, the entire range of intrinsic factors was significant when the reenlistment question was decided. For the OPCOM group, policy matters, peers, and supervisors were the significant extrinsic factors mentioned. The career MAINT Marines saw pay as the significant extrinsic factor.

Figures XI and XII list these factors by career and occupational group.

### A. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

What have been illuminated thus far were the factors which were statistically significant influences on the reenlistment decision for career and first-term Marines in the



telecommunications fields. The following is an analysis of some of the results achieved and their importance to management--principally to commanding officers and to officers in charge of telecommunications personnel.

1. FINDING: Career satisfaction was the one common factor which could be correlated with reenlistment for all groups studied.

The results of this study indicated that the Marines in the sample who stated that they would reenlist had a positive attitude about career satisfaction. The opposite was true for those who did not intend to reenlist. Their generally expressed attitude was one of a lack of career satisfaction. Thus, the conclusion that can be drawn from this finding is that Marines reenlist when they are satisfied with their Marine Corps career. If they aren't reenlisting, the culprit is most likely career dissatisfaction.

2. FINDING: Career satisfaction for the first-term Marines is a function of their perceptions of their work and a feeling of worthwhile accomplishment.

These Marines evidently perceive life in the Marine Corps and their present work as synonymous. The decision to remain with the Marine Corps for at least one more enlistment is brought about by feelings of satisfaction with the present job and a feeling of making a worthwhile contribution to their unit and, by extension, to the Marine Corps. From this it can be concluded that reinforcing individual job satisfaction and ensuring that the younger Marine realizes the importance of



the contribution that he is making will go a long way in making him a willing candidate for retention.

3. FINDING: Career satisfaction for career Marines was supported by the entire range of intrinsic job factors.

For this group of Marines, career and job satisfaction were important factors that accompanied the decision to reenlist. Unlike their younger counterparts, these Marines' reasons for career satisfaction were diverse and manifold. Positive attitudes about career and job satisfaction were upheld by positive perceptions regarding achievement, growth, responsibility, recognition, and the work itself. This meant that the expectations and needs of the career Marines had broadened and expanded. As a younger man, he may lack the sophistication to separate his job from the Marine Corps. As he matures and his horizons and perceptions enlarge, the career Marine finds that more factors come into effect in coloring his felt career satisfaction. Increased responsibility, professional growth, and magnified feelings of accomplishment and achievement play a greater role in modifying his overall opinion of the congruence of his personal life-goals and his career up to that time whether or not it is obvious to him. The greater the satisfaction gap between his needs in these areas and the satisfaction of those needs that his career brings to him, the greater will be his tendency to leave the Marine Corps and seek satisfaction elsewhere.

4. FINDING: The attitudes of the Marines surveyed were positive regarding their jobs being supportive of the unit missions.



The Marines in all four groups who had decided to reenlist were significantly more positive in their perceptions regarding the mission support that their present jobs gave. In no case, however, did any of the subgroups, reenlisting or not, report what could be construed as negative perceptions in this regard. This indicated that these Marines viewed their jobs as necessary to support the organization's objectives. Whether or not the organization's objectives were congruent with their own personal objectives would affect their decision to remain with the Marine Corps or to leave it. The radio technician sees his job as necessary to help his parent unit to achieve its combat missions. Whether or not he sees that job as a radio technician as aiding him to achieve his life objectives will govern his felt career satisfaction. This, in turn, will govern his decision to reenlist or not to reenlist.

5. FINDING: The decision to reenlist was not affected by any common extrinsic job factors.

The heterogeneous spread of extrinsic job factors leads inevitably to a more critical analysis of the interrelation between them and the reenlistment decision. If, instead of focussing on the decision to reenlist, the decision not to reenlist is evaluated along with the decision-makers' responses to the significant extrinsic job factors, the following determinations can be made.

Each of the four groups had different extrinsic factors affecting their reenlistment decision. For the first-term



OPCOM Marines, there was no significant extrinsic factor identified with the reenlistment decision. For the first-term MAINT Marine who had decided not to reenlist, interference with his family and social life by his job--and, by association, the Marine Corps--was the only extrinsic factor of importance.

Career OPCOM Marines who had decided against reenlisting had negative feelings about organizational policies and administration, peers, and their supervisors. Policies were viewed as more restrictive and constraining; peers as less cooperative and helpful; seniors as less responsive.

The extrinsic job factor that surfaced for the career MAINT Marine who decided not to reenlist was inadequate pay for the work he had done. This was a case of a perceived reward not being at least an even trade for the work and effort put into the organization.

The author made the following postulation regarding the significant extrinsic job factors: these factors were not, of themselves, reasons for career and job dissatisfaction. They were the rationalizations of felt dissatisfaction. What is important to management about these extrinsic factors, then, is not so much what they were but that they were the focuses of the dissatisfaction felt. This is to say that the same factors which caused the OPCOM Marine to leave the Marine Corps caused the MAINT Marine to leave. Each had simply found a different justification for leaving. Each had found a definable reason for not reenlisting. This reason may or may not have



had any relevant bearing on the initial decision not to reenlist. But, it was a more tangible factor than are those that were intrinsic to the job. In fact, the dissatisfied Marine may not have even realized that he had made this mental transference. The intrinsic factors were the ones, or at least it was their lack, that caused the dissatisfaction. But the extrinsic factors offered a reference point upon which the dissatisfaction could be blamed.

That this is a reasonable view of the extrinsic job factor and its influence is not difficult to support. Consider the first-term MAINT Marine who was significantly more critical of his work's interference with his family and social life. Why was this particular factor cited by only this one subgroup in the survey? Why was it not a factor for the dissatisfied career Marines who had decided not to reenlist? Surely, due to their longer terms of service, their family lives must have come into conflict with their chosen careers more often than had those of the first-term Marine. Why were policy matters and peers a point of contention for dissatisfied career OPCOM Marines who usually work for the same supervisor as does the career MAINT Marine who cited pay as a significant extrinsic factor? It is strongly suggested that these extrinsic factors were similar to a headache in an ailing person: they were indicative of a problem's existence. They were not necessarily the problem--very probably they were only a symptom of the real malady. By extending the analogy, the root cause of dissatisfaction in this study would appear to have been



the lack of satisfaction with the intrinsic factors that made up the job and, ultimately, the career.

## B. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To say that career satisfaction was a significant factor in the reenlistment decision is supportive of many of the studies made by social scientists into the causes for employees leaving their jobs. It also supports the idea that those who feel that the Marine Corps life is attractive and meets their needs will most likely remain in the Corps. For the younger Marine, his felt career satisfaction was manifested by his satisfaction with his work and a sense of achievement. For the older, more experienced Marine, many more factors came into play to support these feelings of career satisfaction. This is not to say that these other factors were not important for the Marine on his first enlistment; it is just that interest in his work and the feeling of achieving something worthwhile through his work were the primary means taken to express these feelings about his period of service.

What has been pointed out here is that a sense of growth, achievement, and interest in the job was necessary to the feeling of satisfaction with a chosen profession. To be sure, this relationship was initially entered upon as a short-term venture: for two, three, or four years. But when these factors are properly cultivated and nurtured, this can lead to the desire on the part of the individual to remain in the Marine Corps because this is where he perceives that his best interests will be served. At the same time, the Marine sees



himself aligned with others who are similarly motivated. There is a reinforcement of the sense of goal congruence, organizational identity, identification with leaders and peers, and opportunities for growth and achievement.

This then is what must be considered: each man who enlists in the Marine Corps must be given the fairest possible opportunity to fully explore and develop his potentials. As a first step in this direction, it is recommended that a more detailed analysis be made of the job factors shown to be significant for the Marines sampled in this study.

The seventeen intrinsic and extrinsic job factors queried in the Task Analysis Questionnaire differed only slightly in content from the questions asked fifteen years previously in the initial attempts to determine if job satisfaction could be measured and categorized. What is needed now is to delve deeper into these factors to uncover any pivotal ones that are of singular worth in identifying the causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among career and first-term Marines. For example, which is the causal factor, career satisfaction or the intention to reenlist? Dissatisfaction or the decision to leave? What causes the felt satisfaction for the younger Marines to be an apparent function of their work? Is it because they enjoy the nature of the work, their positions and any prestige that attaches thereto? Is it based upon perceptions of responsibility, supervision, or the lack of the same? Is pay a factor? Is the degree of challenge a meaningful factor? When do perceptions expand to include



more of the intrinsic factors as career satisfiers? Concurrently, what causes the perceived feelings of worthwhile accomplishment? Is it due to promotions received or is it the type of work done? How much of a part does patriotism play in supporting the feelings of achievement? Is pay again a factor? Does regard for the Marine Corps enter into the decision?

If the parameters leading to career satisfaction can be reasonably established for the first-term Marines, it is logical to expect that the same can be done for those on subsequent terms of service. An extension of the analysis will facilitate the fixing of those points in the Marine's career at which the other intrinsic and extrinsic job factors come into play and lend more subtlety and shadings to the felt degree of career satisfaction. At the same time, it should be possible to fix the circumstances that cause Marines on their second and subsequent enlistments to begin to lose their keenness, their feelings that they aren't progressing professionally or achieving as they once felt that they could.

The evidence here has shown that the younger Marine has difficulty in separating his immediate work from the Marine Corps. For him, it is the Marine Corps! His work and any sense of worthwhile achievement that he may derive from it determine whether or not he will choose to reenlist. Obviously, if he is mismatched with his job, he stands a good chance of being mismatched with the Marine Corps, since the two are one and the same for him. Thus, the initial problem



in making reenlistment a worthwhile alternative for him when he reaches a decision point is one of attempting to match closely the Marine's job preferences. As was pointed out by Hoehn et al. [1972], over 80 percent of 550 Marine recruits queried about their initial job assignments were satisfied with with these assignments. If the attitudes of these 550 new Marines are truly reflective of Corps-wide perceptions, if the Marine is not generally dissatisfied with his occupational assignment, the other likely area of investigation is the job itself.

Each billet in the Marine Corps is tied to a specific Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) and rank. Each also has a title, e.g., Radio Repairman. The first step is to describe the billet in detail, stating the requirements in skill level, knowledge, and training (cf. Marine Corps Order 1510.24 of 16 July 1974, "Individual Training for Enlisted Marines"). The responsibilities of the job, to whom the man reports, and who reports to him should also be identified. This will serve to identify for the incumbent, his peers, and his seniors what the job entails specifically.

The next step is to identify clearly how the Marine is to be evaluated in his performance. The specific skill levels which must be displayed must be clearly defined and their relationship to a particular proficiency mark must be readily discernable. This will enable the Marine to appraise his own performance, appearance relative to established standards, military skills, etc., and tie them directly to a given



proficiency mark. Similarly, conduct criteria should be readily identifiable by the Marine. For sergeants and above, for whom proficiency and conduct markings no longer apply, the same readily identifiable standards of performance and conduct should enable the man, in effect, to write his own fitness report. Thus, both the Marine and his supervisors, his NCO's and officers, will be currently aware of his abilities, his strengths, shortcomings, and his improvements. More meaningful remedial and progressive training can be devised to bring the Marine, and thereby the unit, up to a higher level of effectiveness and combat readiness. At the same time, those most ready for advancement to positions of more responsibility can be more fairly identified. Periodic counseling sessions will have more relevance and direction since specific areas for improvement and those in which the Marine shows strength can be readily determined. Both supervisor and man will be more aware of specific points of marginal and below-average performance as well as those in which the Marine excels.

These then are the recommendations made as an outgrowth of this study of the Task Analysis Program as it pertains to Marines in the telecommunications occupational fields. First, an in-depth investigation into the factors identified as affecting the reenlistment intentions of Marines in these fields. Second, a comprehensive review of all OF 25 and 28 billets and a written description made of each billet at the unit level. This billet description should be in sufficient detail to allow



it to serve as the primary measuring device for job skills and technical ability. These skills, coupled with military skills, are the job of the Marine!

As was pointed out by the Commandant of the Marine Corps in the close of his posture statement to the Congress of the United States in February 1974:

"The maintenance of an effective military establishment does not rest solely on the sophistication of its weaponry or the funds available to attract recruits. It rests fundamentally on the leadership, integrity and professionalism of its personnel . . ."



## INTRINSIC JOB FACTORS

### WORK ITSELF

1. The work I do is interesting to me.  
(INTERESTING)
2. My daily work makes good use of my skills and knowledge. (SKILLS)
3. My job is at least useful to enable my unit to meet its objectives. (UNIT OBJECTIVES)

### ACHIEVEMENT

1. My job allows me to accomplish something worthwhile. (WORTHWHILE)
2. My job allows me to see or know the results of my efforts. (KNOW RESULTS)
3. Doing my present work gives me a feeling of pride and self-respect. (PRIDE)

### RECOGNITION

1. I get on-the-job recognition I deserve for my performance. (RECOGNITION)

### RESPONSIBILITY

1. I am allowed enough freedom in my job to exercise some personal initiative.  
(INITIATIVE)

### GROWTH

1. My present job helps me to progress professionally. (PROGRESS)

Figure I. Job Factors Examined in Study (Part 1)



## EXTRINSIC JOB FACTORS

### WORKING CONDITIONS

1. I am provided with the essential resources I need to accomplish my job. (Equipment, supplies, and staff) (RESOURCES)
2. The present working conditions (facilities, surroundings) are functional and enhance my effectiveness. (CONDITIONS)

### SUPERVISOR

1. My supervisor provides me with adequate and ongoing feedback on my performance. (FEEDBACK)

### PEERS

1. I have the cooperation and support of my co-workers necessary to do my work efficiently. (CO-WORKERS)
2. My subordinates are well-qualified and can perform in a way that enables me to meet my job objectives. (SUBORDINATES)

### POLICIES

1. Rules and regulations are intended to help you do your job. Do the rules and regulations governing your job enhance your efficiency? (RULES)

### FAMILY AND SOCIAL LIFE

1. My work does not seriously interfere with my family and my social life. (INTERFERENCE)

### PAY

1. I am paid fairly for the work I do. (PAY)

Figure I. Job Factors Examined in Study (Part 2)



JOB SATISFACTION

1. Overall, I am satisfied with my present job.  
(JOB SATISFACTION)

CAREER SATISFACTION

1. I am satisfied with my military career to  
date. (CAREER SATISFACTION)

Figure 1. Job Factors Examined in Study. (Part 3)



# Group Identities

OF28014 - Less than 4 yrs service and will reenlist  
 OF28015 - Less than 4 yrs service and may reenlist  
 OF28016 - Less than 4 yrs service and may not reenlist  
 OF28017 - Less than 4 yrs service and won't reenlist  
 OF28018 - More than 4 yrs service and will reenlist  
 OF28019 - More than 4 yrs service and may reenlist  
 OF28020 - More than 4 yrs service and may not reenlist  
 OF28021 - More than 4 yrs service and won't reenlist

VARIABLE DATA ON: V473 = THE WORK I DO IS INTERESTING TO ME  
 ....INTERVAL.....

	OF28014	OF28015	OF28016	OF28017	OF28018	CF28019	OF28020	OF28021
1	5	4	3	30	3	5	2	7
2	0	7	2	12	6	2	4	7
3	5	7	5	32	11	5	6	11
4	11	27	17	71	33	28	20	25
5	10	25	12	41	58	32	9	19
6	6	8	9	28	52	17	14	14
7	5	9	2	11	41	9	5	14
TOTAL COUNTED ABOVE	42*	87*	50*	225*	204*	98*	60*	97*
OTHER	1	1	2	12	6	1	3	6
MEAN	4.4048	4.4023	4.3600	3.9289	5.2402	4.7041	4.5333	4.4433
STD DEVIATION	1.7052	1.4968	1.4108	1.6342	1.3706	1.3939	1.4885	1.7109

The interval ranges from 1 = very strongly disagree to 7 = very strongly agree.

Figure II. Sample of Printout for Telecommunications Maintenance Occupational Field Job Factor Variables Task Analysis Questionnaire, Broken Down by Reenlistment Intention and Career Status.



JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER OPCOM  
BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION  
( $\bar{N} = 131$ )

<u>Variable</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_y</math>, Will Reenlist</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_n</math>, Won't Reenlist</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Interesting Work (I)	5.01	3.64	1.37	4.281*
Skills (I)	4.32	3.11	1.21	4.033*
Progress (I)	4.41	2.82	1.59	4.969*
Worthwhile (I)	4.67	3.35	1.32	4.125*
Know Results (I)	5.08	3.75	1.33	4.290*
Pay (E)	4.35	3.66	0.69	2.300
Recognition (I)	4.44	3.50	0.94	2.765*
Pride (I)	4.84	3.34	1.50	4.688*
Feedback (E)	4.33	3.38	0.95	2.794*
Co-workers (E)	4.96	4.16	0.80	2.581*
Subordinates (E)	4.65	4.21	0.44	1.571
Initiative (I)	5.31	4.14	1.17	3.744*
Rules (E)	4.47	3.44	1.03	3.433*
Resources (E)	3.89	3.38	0.51	1.645
Conditions (E)	4.09	3.32	0.77	2.484
Interference (E)	4.01	3.78	0.23	0.639
Job Satisfaction	4.69	3.13	1.56	4.457*
Career Satisfaction	5.16	3.25	1.91	7.074*
Unit Objectives (I)	5.69	4.53	1.16	4.000*

\*  $p \leq 0.01$

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure III



JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM OPCOM  
BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION  
( $\bar{N}$  = 386)

<u>Variable</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_y</math>, Will Reenlist</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_n</math>, Won't Reenlist</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Interesting Work (I)	4.60	3.48	1.12	3.394*
Skills (I)	3.63	2.96	0.67	2.030
Progress (I)	3.62	2.91	0.71	2.028
Worthwhile (I)	4.17	3.10	1.07	3.169*
Know Results (I)	4.47	3.70	0.77	2.257
Pay (E)	4.00	3.31	0.69	2.156
Recognition (I)	3.23	3.17	0.06	0.188
Pride (I)	4.07	3.18	0.89	2.542
Feedback (E)	3.80	3.35	0.45	1.324
Co-workers (E)	3.77	3.86	-0.09	0.265
Subordinates (E)	4.10	3.86	0.24	0.774
Initiative (I)	3.62	3.83	-0.21	0.600
Rules (E)	4.17	3.55	0.62	1.722
Resources (E)	3.43	3.80	-0.37	1.088
Conditions (E)	3.63	3.40	0.23	0.697
Interference (E)	3.97	3.56	0.41	1.079
Job Satisfaction	3.83	3.19	0.64	1.730
Career Satisfaction	4.67	2.92	1.75	5.303*
Unit Objectives (I)	4.93	4.33	0.60	1.853

\*  $p \leq 0.01$

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure IV



JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER MAINT  
BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION  
( $\bar{N}$  = 292)

<u>Variable</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_y</math>, Will Reenlist</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_n</math>, Won't Reenlist</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Interesting Work (I)	5.24	4.44	0.80	4.444*
Skills (I)	4.29	3.64	0.65	3.095*
Progress (I)	4.64	3.44	1.20	8.000*
Worthwhile (I)	4.98	4.13	0.85	4.472*
Know Results (I)	5.01	4.62	0.39	2.053
Pay (E)	4.25	3.72	0.53	2.789*
Recognition (I)	4.45	3.71	0.74	3.700*
Pride (I)	4.85	3.93	0.92	4.600*
Feedback (E)	4.28	4.04	0.24	1.143
Co-workers (E)	5.04	4.76	0.28	1.556
Subordinates (E)	4.51	4.45	0.06	0.316
Initiative (I)	5.00	4.46	0.54	2.842*
Rules (E)	4.28	3.87	0.41	2.412
Resources (E)	3.30	3.15	0.15	0.789
Conditions (E)	3.62	3.27	0.35	1.667
Interference (E)	4.17	3.58	0.59	2.565
Job Satisfaction	4.49	3.46	1.03	4.682*
Career Satisfaction	4.95	3.26	1.69	8.450*
Unit Objectives (I)	5.66	5.17	0.49	3.063*

\*  $p < 0.01$

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure V



JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM MAINT  
 BASED UPON REENLISTMENT DECISION  
 ( $\bar{N} = 261$ )

<u>Variable</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_y</math>, Will Reenlist</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}_n</math>, Won't Reenlist</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Interesting Work (I)	4.40	3.93	0.47	1.679
Skills (I)	3.64	3.24	0.40	1.379
Progress (I)	3.74	3.11	0.63	2.250
Worthwhile (I)	4.61	3.54	1.07	3.963*
Know Results (I)	4.58	4.15	0.43	1.654
Pay (E)	3.90	3.36	0.54	2.000
Recognition (I)	4.07	3.48	0.59	2.185
Pride (I)	4.27	3.48	0.79	2.821*
Feedback (E)	4.24	3.60	0.64	2.560
Co-workers (E)	4.60	4.34	0.26	1.000
Subordinates (E)	4.17	3.98	0.19	0.792
Initiative (I)	4.60	4.08	0.52	1.733
Rules (E)	3.71	3.13	0.58	2.320
Resources (E)	3.52	3.44	0.08	0.320
Conditions (E)	3.62	3.20	0.42	1.615
Interference (E)	4.24	3.33	0.91	2.844*
Job Satisfaction	4.10	3.05	1.05	3.500*
Career Satisfaction	4.74	2.80	1.94	6.690*
Unit Objectives (I)	5.32	4.54	0.78	2.690*

\*  $p < 0.01$

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure VI



JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER OPCOM  
LISTED BY DIFFERENCE  
(d =  $\bar{X}_y - \bar{X}_n$ )

<u>Variable</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Career Satisfaction	1.91	7.074*
Progress (I)	1.59	4.969*
Job Satisfaction	1.56	4.457*
Pride (I)	1.50	4.688*
Interesting Work (I)	1.37	4.281*
Know Results (I)	1.33	4.290*
Worthwhile (I)	1.32	4.125*
Skills (I)	1.21	4.033*
Initiative (I)	1.17	3.744*
Unit Objectives (I)	1.16	4.000*
Rules (E)	1.03	3.433*
Feedback (E)	0.95	2.794*
Recognition (I)	0.94	2.765*
Co-workers (E)	0.80	2.581*
Conditions (E)	0.77	2.484
Pay (E)	1.69	2.300
Resources (E)	0.51	1.645
Subordinates (E)	0.44	1.571
Interference (E)	0.23	0.639

\* p < 0.01

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure VII



JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM OPCOM  
LISTED BY DIFFERENCE  
( $d = \bar{X}_y - \bar{X}_n$ )

<u>Variable</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Career Satisfaction	1.75	5.303*
Interesting Work (I)	1.12	3.394*
Worthwhile (I)	1.07	3.169*
Pride (I)	0.89	2.542
Know Results (I)	0.77	2.257
Progress (I)	0.71	2.028
Pay (E)	0.69	2.156
Skills (I)	0.67	2.030
Job Satisfaction	0.64	1.730
Rules (E)	0.62	1.722
Unit Objectives (I)	0.60	1.853
Feedback (E)	0.45	1.324
Interference (E)	0.41	1.079
Subordinates (E)	0.24	0.774
Conditions (E)	0.23	0.697
Recognition (I)	0.06	0.188
Co-workers (E)	-0.09	0.265
Initiative (I)	-0.21	0.600
Resources (E)	-0.37	1.088

\*  $p < 0.01$

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure VIII



JOB FACTORS FOR CAREER MAINT  
LISTED BY DIFFERENCE  
(d =  $\bar{X}_y - \bar{X}_n$ )

<u>Variable</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Career Satisfaction	1.69	8.450*
Progress (I)	1.20	8.000*
Job Satisfaction	1.03	4.682*
Pride (I)	0.92	4.600*
Worthwhile (I)	0.85	4.472*
Interesting Work (I)	0.80	4.444*
Recognition (I)	0.74	3.700*
Skills (I)	0.65	3.095*
Interference (E)	0.59	2.565
Initiative (I)	0.54	2.842*
Pay (E)	0.53	2.789*
Unit Objectives (I)	0.49	3.063*
Rules (E)	0.41	2.412
Know Results (I)	0.39	2.053
Conditions (E)	0.35	1.667
Co-workers (E)	0.28	1.556
Feedback (E)	0.24	1.143
Resources (E)	0.15	0.789
Subordinates (E)	0.006	0.316

\* p < 0.01

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure IX



JOB FACTORS FOR FIRST-TERM MAINT  
LISTED BY DIFFERENCE  
( $d = \bar{X}_y - \bar{X}_n$ )

<u>Variable</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>t</u>
Career Satisfaction	1.94	6.690*
Worthwhile (I)	1.07	3.963*
Job Satisfaction	1.05	3.500*
Interference (E)	0.91	2.844*
Pride (I)	0.79	2.821*
Unit Objectives (I)	0.78	2.690*
Feedback (E)	0.64	2.560
Progress (I)	0.63	2.250
Recognition (I)	0.59	2.185
Rules (E)	0.58	2.320
Pay (E)	0.54	2.000
Initiative (I)	0.52	1.733
Interesting Work (I)	0.47	1.679
Know Results (I)	0.43	1.654
Conditions (E)	0.42	1.615
Skills (I)	0.40	1.379
Co-workers (E)	0.26	1.000
Subordinates (E)	0.19	0.792
Resources (E)	0.08	0.320

\*  $p \leq 0.01$

(I) = Intrinsic Factor

(E) = Extrinsic Factor

Figure X



SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS  
FOR OPCOM MARINES

<u>Career</u>	<u>First-term</u>
Career Satisfaction Job Satisfaction	Career Satisfaction
<u>INTRINSIC FACTORS</u>	<u>INTRINSIC FACTORS</u>
Progress Pride Interesting Work Know Results Worthwhile Skills Initiative Unit Objectives Recognition	Interesting Work Worthwhile
<u>EXTRINSIC FACTORS</u>	
Rules Feedback Co-workers	

Figure XI



SIGNIFICANT JOB FACTORS  
FOR MAINT MARINES

<u>Career</u>	<u>First-term</u>
Career Satisfaction Job Satisfaction	Career Satisfaction Job Satisfaction
<u>INTRINSIC FACTORS</u>	<u>INTRINSIC FACTORS</u>
Progress Pride Worthwhile Interesting Work Recognition Skills Initiative Unit Objectives	Worthwhile Pride Unit Objectives
<u>EXTRINSIC FACTORS</u>	<u>EXTRINSIC FACTORS</u>
Pay	Interference

Figure XII



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Air Force Human Relations Laboratory, Trends in Enlistment Motivation, by A.H. Fisher, Jr. and M.A. Harford, 1973.
- Air Force Human Relations Laboratory, Attitudes of Youth Toward Military Service, by A.B. Nadel, 1973.
- Angle, H.L., The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and First-Term Reenlistment in the U.S. Marine Corps, M.A. Thesis, San Diego State College, 1971.
- Atchison, T.J. and Lefferts, E.A., "The Prediction of Turn-over Using Herzberg's Job Satisfaction Techniques," Personnel Psychology, 25, pp. 53-64, 1972.
- Brayfield, A.H. and Crockett, W.H., "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance," Psychological Bulletin, pp. 396-424, September 1955.
- Center for Naval Analyses, Accession and Retention in the Navy, Summary Report 2, by R.F. Lockman and D.M. O'Neill, 1973.
- Center for Naval Analyses, An Exploratory Study of Job Satisfaction, Retention, and Performance of Navy Enlisted Men, 1971.
- Cummings, G.J. and Shannan, M.J., "Manpower Planning," Marine Corps Gazette, pp. 30-33, June 1974.
- Dawis, R.V., England, G.E., and Lofquist, L.H., "A Theory of Work Adjustment: A Revision," Bulletin 47, University of Minnesota, 1968.
- Dunnette, M.D., Campbell, J.P., and Hakel, M.D., "Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in Six Occupational Groups," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2, pp. 143-174, 1967.
- Ewen, R.B., "Some Determinants of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 48, 3, pp. 161-163, 1964.
- Gellerman, S.W., Motivation and Productivity, American Management Association, 1963.
- George Washington University, Institute of Management Science, The Supply of Volunteers to the Armed Forces Revisited, 1971.



- Hackman, J.R. and Lawler, E.E. III, "Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics," Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 3, pp. 259-286, 1971.
- Haldern, G., "Relative Contributions of Motivational and Hygiene Factors to Overall Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 3, p. 198, 1966.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B., The Motivation to Work, Wiley, 1959.
- Herzberg, F., "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees," Harvard Business Review, pp. 53-62, January-February 1968.
- Hughes, H., Job Satisfaction in Industry and in the Military, Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Hulin, C.L., "Job Satisfaction and Turnover in a Female Clerical Population," Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 3, pp. 280-285, 1966.
- Human Relations Research Organization, Recruits' Military Preferences and Their Accommodation by the Military Services, by A.J. Hoehn, T.R. Wilson, and J.A. Richards, 1972.
- Human Relations Research Organization, Recruits' Civilian-Acquired Skills: Their Potential Value and Their Utilization in Initial Military Assignments, by A.J. Hoehn, T.R. Wilson, and J.A. Richards, 1972.
- Kirchner, N.K., "Job Attitudes and Performance," Personnel Administration, 30, pp. 42-45, 1967.
- Kuhlen, R.G., "Needs, Perceived Need Satisfaction Opportunities, and Satisfaction within Occupation," Journal of Applied Psychology, 41, 1, pp. 56-64, 1963.
- Lawler, E.E., III, "Job Attitudes and Employee Motivation: Theory, Research, and Practice," Personnel Psychology, 23, pp. 223-237, 1970.
- Lindsay, C.A., Marks, E., and Gorlow, L., "The Herzberg: A Critique and Reformation," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 4, pp. 330-339, 1967.
- Malinovsky, M.R. and Barry, J.R., "Determinants of Work Attitudes," Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 6, pp. 446-451, 1965.
- March, J.G. and Simon, H.A., Organizations, Wiley, 1958.
- Maslow, A.H., "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychology Review, pp. 67-75, July 1943.



- McClelland, D.C., "That Urge to Achieve," in Contemporary Readings in Organizational Behavior, ed. by F.W. Luthans, pp. 258-267, McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- McClelland, D.C., "Money as a Motivator," in Contemporary Readings in Organizational Behavior, ed. by F.W. Luthans, pp. 368-376, McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- McDonald, B.W. and Gunderson, E.K.R., "Correlates of Job Satisfaction in Naval Environments," Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 3, pp. 371-373, 1974.
- McGregor, D.M., "The Human Side of Enterprise," in Contemporary Readings in Organizational Behavior, ed. by F.W. Luthans, pp. 31-40, McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Morgan, J.S., Managing the Young Adults, American Management Association, 1967.
- Morse, J.J. and Lorsch, J.W., "Beyond Theory Y," Harvard Business Review, pp. 61-68, May-June 1970.
- Navy Medical Neuropsychiatric Research Unit, Changes in Marine Recruits' Attitudes Related to Recruit Characteristics and Drill Instructors' Attitudes, by R.F. Booth and A. Holberg, 1972.
- Navy Medical Neuropsychiatric Research Unit, Attitudes of Marines During First Enlistment, by P.D. Nelson and N.H. Berry, 1966.
- Navy Medical Neuropsychiatric Research Unit, Attitudes and Values as Predictors of Military Performance, by W.L. Wilkins, 1967.
- Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, Evaluation of Occupational Choices in the Marine Corps, by A.C.F. Gilbert and T.M.I. Yellen, 1973.
- Office of Manpower Utilization, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, A Synopsis of the U.S. Marine Corps Task Analysis Program, 1974.
- Patchen, M., Participation, Achievement, and Involvement on the Job, Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Porter, L.W. and Lawler, E.E., III, Managerial Attitudes and Performance, Irwin, 1968.
- Siegel, S., Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, McGraw-Hill, 1956.



- Triandis, H.C., "A Critique and Experimental Design for the Study of the Relationship Between Productivity and Job Satisfaction," Psychology Bulletin, LVI, pp. 309-312, July 1959.
- University of California, Irvine, California, Organizational, Work and Personal Factors in Turnover and Absenteeism, by L.W. Porter and R.M. Steers, 1972.
- Varney, G.H., Management by Objectives, Dartnell Corporation, 1971.
- Vroom, V.H., Work and Motivation, Wiley, 1964.
- Wanous, J.P. and Lawler, E.E. III, "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 2, pp. 95-105, 1972.
- Waters, L.K. and Roach, D., "Relationship Between Job Attitudes and Two Forms of Withdrawal From the Work Situation," Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 3, pp. 92-94, 1971.



# INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Document Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2. Library, Code 0212 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	2
3. Department Chairman, Code 55 Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
4. Commander R. A. Stephan, Code 55 (Thesis Advisor) Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
5. Lieutenant Colonel R. E. Jamison, USMC Code 0309 (Second Reader) Marine Corps Representative Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
6. Captain Rayon Hughes Carlisle, Jr., USMCR 988 Leahy Road Monterey, California 93940	1
7. Lieutenant Colonel H. L. Angle, USMC Office of Manpower Utilization (Code MPU) Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia 22134	1



158389

Thesis  
C224  
c.1

Carlisle  
An investigation into  
the job factors affect-  
ing the reenlistment  
of Marines in the  
telecommunications  
fields.

25 JUL 78  
2 OCT 79  
1 DEC 79  
1 NOV 82

~~25457~~  
26521  
26521  
28029

158389

ation into  
rs affect-  
stment  
the  
ons

Thesis  
C224  
c.1

Carlisle

158389

An investigation into  
the job factors affect-  
ing the reenlistment  
of Marines in the  
telecommunications  
fields.

thesC224

An investigation into the job factors af



3 2768 002 08536 7

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY